

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Applicants would like to thank the examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. By the present amendment, claims 1-8 remain in the application while claim 1 has been amended. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

Claims 1-3 and 5-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takano et al. US 5,850,254 in view of Uomori et al., "Electronic Image Stabilization system for video cameras and VCRs", February 1992. Claims 4, 5 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takano in view of Uomori, further in view of Roboyham et al. US 6,160,907. As described above, claim 1 has been amended, and for the following reasons the rejection is respectfully traversed.

Regarding claim 1, Takano in view of Uomori and Roboyham does not teach, suggest or otherwise render obvious "swing compensation image processing means for processing the images taken by the image taking means with a swing compensation for a swing on a special distance plane distant from the image taking means *to said road surface or a surface between the image taking means and the road surface*," as required.

As acknowledged in the Office action, Takano does not explicitly teach swing compensation image processing means. Thus, Uomori is cited for teaching this limitation. the Examiner points out that Uomori discloses swing compensation image processing means for processing the images taken by the image taking means with a swing compensation for a swing on a special distance plane distant from the image taking means.

However, as shown in FIG. 2 of Uomori, swing compensation image processing means compensates the images by parallel translation. As shown in FIG. 4 of the present application, in case that the image processing means is swing in the horizontal direction (Dx), the degree of the swing on the image is varied in response to the distance such as, for example, Z0, Z1 or Z2. In this case, the disclosure of Uomori cannot compensate the images affected by the swing of the image taking means because of the fact that the disclosure of Uomori compensates the images by only parallel translation.

In contrast, the operation support device defined in claim 1 comprises swing compensation image processing means for processing the images taken by the image taking means with a swing compensation for a swing on a special distance plane distant from the image taking means to the road surface or a surface between the image taking means and the road surface. In other words, the operation support device defined in claim 1 is preliminarily determined the special distance plane distant such as, for example, Z0, Z1 or Z2 from the image taking means to the road surface or a surface between the image taking means and the road surface. Therefore, the operation support device defined in claim 1 can compensate the images affected by the swing of the image taking means under the case that the image processing means is swung in the horizontal direction.

It is therefore believed that the operation support device defined in the amended claim 1 is completely different in construction and advantage from the disclosure of Uomori.

As will be seen from the foregoing description, each of Takano and Uomori does not teach the swing compensation image processing means for processing the images taken by the image taking means with a swing compensation for a swing on a special distance plane distant from the image taking means to the road surface or a surface between the image taking means

and the road surface. Accordingly, it is believed that the operation support device defined in the amended claim 1 is completely different in construction and advantage from the disclosure of Takano in view of Uomori. Furthermore, nothing in Robotham makes up for the deficiencies of Takano and Uomori. Therefore, as the prior art references fail to render all the limitations in claim 1 obvious, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

Claim 2-8 depends from claim 1 and are, therefore, allowable for at least the reasons provided in support of the allowability of claim 1.

In consideration of the foregoing analysis, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. ARI-41069.

Respectfully submitted,  
PEARNE & GORDON, LLP

By: /Aaron A. Fishman/  
Aaron A. Fishman, Reg. No. 44682

1801 East 9<sup>th</sup> Street  
Suite 1200  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108  
(216) 579-1700

Date: August 17, 2011